DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 307 922 JC 890 281

AUTHOR Kanter, Martha
TITLE Report on the California Postsecondary Education Commission.
INSTITUTION California Community Colleges, Sacramento. Office of the Chancellor.
PUB DATE Jul 89
NOTE 11p.; Discussed as agenda item number 6 at a meeting of the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges (Millbrae, CA, July 13-14, 1989).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Transfer Students; *Community Colleges; *Educational Finance; Higher Education; *Policy Formation; State Colleges; State Universities; *Statewide Planning; Transfer Policy; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *California

ABSTRACT

The June 26, 1989 meeting of the California Postsecondary Education Commission considered a number of policy issues with direct implications for the state's community colleges. The major actions and discussions of the Commission's meeting focused on: (1) updated statistics on community college transfers to the University of California and the California State University systems, which showed that in both systems the numbers of transfer students enrolled in fall 1988 increased over the previous year, with Hispanic students making the greatest gains of any ethnic group; (2) state policy guidelines for adjusting nonresident tuition at California's public colleges and universities; (3) an update on six budget priorities (i.e., expanding funding for adult programs in English as a Second Language, supporting enrollment growth, implementing legislatively mandated community college reforms, expanding student financial assistance, maintaining low student fees, and funding capital outlay); (4) the expansion of the Commission's role in program projection, approval, and review activities; and (5) the promotion of doctoral programs for community college faculty and administrators. This report offers brief summaries of the Commission's discussions of each of these areas and other relevant topics and highlights implications for the Office of the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges and the colleges themselves. (ALB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED307922

Board of Governors
California Community Colleges
July 13-14, 1989

REPORT ON THE CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION

6

Staff Presentation by:

Martha Kanter

Assistant Deputy Chancellor
Policy Development

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Smith

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SC 890 281

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

REPORT ON THE CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION

6

A Report

Background

The most recent meeting of the California Postsecondary Education Commission was held on June 26. The agenda for the meeting focused on specific educational policy issues related to legislation, community college transfer statistics, private postsecondary education, program evaluation, doctoral programs for community college faculty and administrators, and fiscal policy, including a progress report on the Commission's study of space utilization and standards.

The Commission's work is monitored by the Chancellor's Office through staff participation on advisory committees and frequent staff-to-staff contact. The results and evaluation of this monitoring are reported regularly to the Board of Governors' representatives to the Commission as background for their participation in the development of Commission policy and recommendations. As circumstances warrant, recommendations for specific action by the Board on policy issues before the Commission are presented in the Analysis Section of this report.

Analysis

Major action and discussion at the Commission's meeting focused on the following areas:

1. *Update of Community College Transfer Student Statistics, Fall 1988*

   This report presents descriptive data on the number of community college students who transfer to the University of California (UC) and California State University (CSU) systems. Policy issues and trends in achieving greater representation of ethnic minority students among transfers are also described. Generally, the report notes that progress is being achieved in the 1980s in both numbers of transfers and representation of ethnic minorities, but that

significant gaps still exist. Major factors contributing to the progress cited are improved articulation, more uniform treatment of course credits, and stronger efforts to provide students with transfer information.

Specifically, the report shows that both UC and CSU increased the number of transfer students they enrolled in Fall 1988 over the previous year. Transfer students enrolled at the eight general UC campuses increased from a low of 4,861 in 1986 to 5,934 in 1988. During the same period, the nineteen CSU campuses reported an increase from 27,761 in 1986 to 29,393 in 1988. The 47 independent institutions that submitted enrollment data to the Commission for Fall 1988 reported that they had enrolled 5,238 community college transfer students.

In this report, Hispanic transfer students have made the greatest progress. From Fall 1982 through Fall 1988, UC community college Hispanic transfers increased from 389 to 643. Again during this same period, CSU community college Hispanic transfers increased from 2,467 to 3,019. Although this trend is positive, the numbers are still disappointingly small. The number of Black students transferring increased slightly during this period, but no substantial gain has been made in Black transfer rates over time. UC Asian transfer students from community colleges increased from 519 in 1982 to 742 in Fall 1988. At CSU their numbers increased from 2,309 to 2,665.

Nearly 40 percent of the community colleges reported an increase in the number of students who transferred to UC in Fall 1988. As in the past, a relatively small number of colleges (18) accounted for 55 percent of the University-bound transfer students. Proximity to a four-year campus is a major factor influencing transfer.

According to the report, improvement in UC access for transfer students may be explained in terms of several conditions:

a. Voluntary, largely regional agreements between University campuses and their feeder colleges all but guarantee admission of students who complete requirements and meet academic standards.

b. Improved communication between University and community college faculty and student services staff on transfer and articulation matters.

c. Early and continuing counseling of community college students about transfer by University personnel.

d. Segmental faculty conferring on courses and programs.

Additionally, the report expresses concerns about the CSU transfer data, including the:

a. Relatively small increase in numbers of community college transfers enrolling at CSU;

b. Impact on CSU of increases in UC transfer enrollments;

c. Increase in new freshman enrollment at CSU; and

d. Lack of information about the effects of oversubscribed programs and priorities in admission to specific CSU campuses.

The report also notes present deficiencies in community college transfer data, citing its primary reliance on fall term data. It is important to note that a significant number of students transfer in the winter and spring terms – approximately 30 percent. Further, information on students who transfer to independent institutions is incomplete, since only 47 of those institutions submitted data for this report. Some studies indicate that students who transfer to independent institutions represent one-third of all transfers.

Several key issues for community colleges were not addressed in the report:

- The Transfer Center Project which was implemented in 1985 was not mentioned in the report as a possible reason for the increase in transfer.

- Since the report does not include data on the number of community college students who applied, were eligible, enrolled, and were admitted, it is difficult to know whether the increase in transfer is due to an increased number of applicants or whether it might be due, at least in part, to the decision by UC to admit more community college transfers. Similarly, it is difficult to know whether the CSU transfer statistics are affected by some campuses' decision to admit more freshmen and fewer transfer applicants (e.g., San Diego State University).

- The Commission's commentary on transfer guarantees questions whether the program should be established in statute or remain voluntary. Such comments could influence current negotiations underway between the segments on the implementation of the program.

- The 10 CSU campuses that have virtual transfer guarantee agreements with 44 community colleges were not noted.

- Two other issues not addressed in the report include: (1) the increasing proportion of California high school graduates who enroll directly at UC and CSU as freshmen, and (2) the large number of community college students who are admitted as transfers to these segments but elect not to enroll. These two factors have a direct impact on the number of transfer students.

Staff recommends that the Board request the Commission to expand future annual reports in three areas:

1. That the Commission include in its annual report:

   a. The number of community college transfer students that applied, are eligible, are admitted, and enroll, by subject areas; and

   b. An analysis of the impact of oversubscribed UC and CSU programs on transfer enrollments.

2. That the report include a discussion of the Transfer Center Project and its impact transfer rates.

3. That the Commission examine why Hispanic transfer rates are increasing, but Black transfer rates are not. Included in this study would be an analysis of the rates of Black students who transfer out-of-state, and reviews of Puente and other projects designed to increase the transfer rates of ethnic minorities.

2. *State Policy Guidelines for Adjusting Nonresident Tuition at California's Public Colleges and Universities.*

This report responds to the Legislature's request that the Commission recommend a long-term, nonresident tuition policy for California's public colleges and universities (SCR 69, Morgan, 1988). The report proposes policy guidelines on annual adjustments to the level of nonresident tuition charged. These include:

- Methodologies used by each of the public postsecondary segments to determine the level of nonresident tuition should be based upon:

  1. The total nonresident charges used by each of their public comparison institutions for UC and CSU; and

  2. The segment's full average cost of instruction, with the caveat that "under no circumstances should a segment's level of nonresident tuition plus required fees fall below the marginal cost of instruction."

- Segmental policies to ensure that increases in the level of nonresident tuition are gradual, moderate, and predictable, by providing nonresident students a ten-month minimum notice of tuition increases.

- Methodologies formulated by each governing board for adjusting the level of nonresident tuition, ensuring that the methodology is consistent with existing statute and these recommendations.

The report concludes that the methodologies used by the three public segments are consistent with their missions and compatible with the State's existing resident-fee policy, and that California's nonresident charges are close to, or slightly higher than those charged by comparable public institutions in other states.

Staff suggests that the Board support the Commission's report with minor technical revisions provided to the Commission at its June meeting.

3. *Budget Update for June 1989*

This report provides an update on the status of six budget priorities approved by the Commission at its March meeting. These include:

- Expanding funding for adult education programs in English as a Second Language and basic skills;
- Supporting enrollment growth in California's public colleges and universities;
- Implementing the community college reforms of AB 1725;
- Expanding student financial assistance;
- Maintaining low fees for students in public higher education; and
- Funding capital outlay.

The report concludes with a discussion of the differences between the Senate and Assembly versions of the 1989-90 budget bill and of fiscal issues currently under negotiation, including constraints imposed by the State's Gann Limit, legislative compromises on Proposition 98, the State's transportation needs, and whether legislative differences can be reconciled given the State's new revenue projections.

The report notes that since the Commission's April meeting, augmentations to the capital budgets for the California State University (CSU) and California Community Colleges were approved by the legislative subcommittees, including the funding of additional community college capital outlay projects and the establishment of two new CSU off-campus centers in Salinas and South Orange.

4. *Overseeing the Heart of the Enterprise: The Commission's Thirteenth Annual Report on Program Projection, Approval, and Review Activities, 1987-88*

One of the Joint Committee's recommendations from its Review of the Master Plan is to expand the Commission's role in program review. This report presents a policy context for the Commission to "reevaluate its role in the program review process." This report covers the procedures for program review and approval and provides data on the number of internal reviews and approvals made by each segment in 1987-88. The report raises concern about lack of sufficient data reported by community colleges on program review activities and of the drop in new community college program approval applications.

Staff notes a discrepancy between the number of new program approvals reported to the Board of Governors in its July 1989 agenda (28) and the number reported by the Commission in this report (15) and recommends that a technical modification be made to reconcile this difference prior to Commission action on its report.

The report further commends the progress made by the Board in setting course and program approval standards and the efforts by the Chancellor's Office and local community colleges to improve the approval process in order to remedy existing deficiencies in community college curriculum development and review. The report recommends that the Board prepare an inventory of existing local program evaluation activities for the Commission's 1990 annual report and take steps to develop a projection system for new programs in the future.

5. *Advancing Leadership: Doctoral Programs for Community College Faculty and Administrators*

This report updates the Commission on a March 1987 recommendation made by its Intersegmental Program Review Council (IPRC) that information be gathered on the content, structure, and delivery of doctoral programs relevant to community college faculty and administrators. This study resulted from a concern about limited opportunities for community college staff seeking doctorates in education.

The report notes that while few doctoral programs in California's universities address the needs of current and future community college administrators, four University campuses offer a doctorate in education (Berkeley, UCLA, Riverside, and Santa Barbara). Highlighted in the report are two programs that offer community college faculty and staff opportunities to specialize in community college administration: (1) UCLA's Community College Studies Program, and (2) a graduate program in education at UC Berkeley that has a concentration in community colleges. The report also identifies a number of programs and courses related to community college leadership at eight CSU campuses (Chico, Hayward, Long Beach, Los Angeles, Northridge, Sacramento,

San Diego, and San Jose) and at ten accredited independent institutions, four of which offer opportunities for specialization in community colleges (Claremont, Pepperdine, University of San Francisco, and University of Southern California).

The report concludes with a series of suggestions for further consideration by the IPRC and later by the Commission, including:

a. The need for doctoral programs for community college faculty in areas of "subject matter competence, interdisciplinary study, and pedagogy" and for those who want to enter or advance in community college administration;

b. The need to connect professional development for community college faculty and staff to doctoral programs, enhancing staff development programs;

c. The establishment of "certificate programs in postsecondary teaching offered as professional development" with a link to doctoral coursework; and

d. The development of doctoral programs in community college education, with "specific tracks for administration, business, and discipline-specific study."

Other Matters of Interest

The Commission also discussed a number of other important items:

- *Status of Activities to Implement the Recommendations of the Joint Committee for Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education*

An update on the status of activities to implement recommendations of the Joint Committee for the Review of the Master Plan was presented. Noted in the report was the fact that 12 different bills have already been introduced in this year's legislative session, although some will become two-year bills. In relationship to California Community Colleges, some of these overlap; some are inconsistent with language in AB 1725, others are duplicative; and still others, such as SB 507, are a high priority of the Board of Governors. Staff suggests that the Board continue to identify its top priorities for legislation based upon the Joint Committee's recommendations and carefully monitor these and additional bills regarding Master Plan implementation.

- *Recommendations for Revising the Private Postsecondary Education Act of 1977*

The Commission adopted the report *Recommendations for Revising the Private Postsecondary Education Act of 1977*, prepared in response to the Legislature's request that the Commission review the State's major law regulating private postsecondary education, which will sunset on January 1, 1992. Eight recommendations presented to the Board at its May meeting were adopted, including "abolition of the current Council for Private Postsecondary Educational Institutions and its replacement with a regulatory body to provide the leadership, planning, and oversight needed to maintain and develop a strong private sector of California's postsecondary education community." A definition of "licensure" was included in the report. SB 190 (Morgan) has been introduced to implement these recommendations and the Board has taken a support position on this bill.

- *Supplemental Report on Academic Salaries, 1988-89*

The Commission reviewed descriptive data on faculty salaries in the California Community Colleges; salaries of campus and central office administrators at the University of California and California State University, with comparison-institution data for the campus positions; and salaries for University full-time University medical physicians, including comparisons with their out-of-state institutional counterparts. As shown in this report, the salary disparity between community college districts may be a major factor affecting faculty replacements (approximately 18,000 new faculty to be replaced) that will be needed over the next 15 years in response to anticipated enrollment growth and retirements or attrition.

- *Progress on the Commission's Study of Space and Utilization Standards*

The Commission received a progress report on its study of space and utilization standards. Upon completion of this study, it is anticipated that appropriate adjustments to the existing space and utilization standards will enable community colleges to operate more effectively. Staff recommends that the Board commend Commission staff for its excellent work in coordinating this study and keeping the project focused and on schedule.

- *Progress on the Activities of the Intersegmental Coordinating Council*

The Commission received a progress report on the activities of the Intersegmental Coordinating Council of the California Education Round Table. The report presents a brief history of the Council; its members, funding and staff; structure and activities of its four clusters set up to achieve the goals of 1) transfer and articulation, 2) outreach and student preparation, 3) curriculum

and assessment, and 4) improvement of teaching; and issues for future consideration by the Commission.

These issues include questions raised by the Commission regarding its effectiveness in four areas: "its role in implementing the Joint Committee's recommendations, its funding and whether it can continue to be funded on a voluntary basis through redirection of segmental resources, its effectiveness in carrying out its priority activities, and its relation to the intersegmental budget process."

- *Fiscal Data Abstract, June 1989*

The Commission reviewed information on the financing of California public postsecondary education during the past 25 years, including the derivation of funding levels, State General Fund support ratios for the main operating functions, and capital facilities. Changes in student fees, the State's student financial aid programs, and other fiscal indices are also presented.

- *Revisions to the Commission's Faculty Salary Methodology for the California State University*

The Commission took final action on the report, *Revisions to the Commission's Faculty Salary Methodology for the California State University*, presented at its April meeting. At its June meeting, the Commission also considered legislation affecting California higher education and reviewed a prospectus for evaluating funding of the California State University's statewide nursing program.

Staff Presentation: *Martha Kanter, Assistant Deputy Chancellor*
Policy Development

ERIC Clearinghouse for
Junior Colleges
JUL 21 1989